

**Vendor Meeting Agenda**  
**US EPA Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program**  
**Lead-in-Dust Performance Verification Test**  
**June 27, 2001**



8:45 am	Registration
9:00 am	Opening Remarks and Agenda Review - <i>Eric Koglin (US EPA/NERL)</i>
9:05 am	Introduction of Speakers - <i>Roger Jenkins (ORNL)</i>
9:10 am	Overview of the ETV Program - <i>Penny Hansen (US EPA/ORD)</i>
9:30 am	Goals and Objectives of the ETV Advanced Monitoring Technology Center - <i>Eric Koglin</i>
9:50 am	Return on Investment: Why Participate in the ETV Process? - <i>Roger Jenkins</i>
10:15 am	BREAK
10:30 am	User Perspective - <i>Peter Ashley (HUD)</i>
10:45 am	Regulatory Perspective - <i>John Schwemberger (US EPA/OPPT)</i>
11:00 am	Industry Perspective - <i>Kenn White (AIHA)</i>
11:15 am	State Perspective - <i>Paul Halfmann (Massachusetts Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program)</i>
11:30 am	LUNCH - on your own
1:00 pm	Draft Experimental Design - <i>Amy Dindal and Chuck Bayne (ORNL)</i> - matrix, concentration levels, number of samples, performance factors
2:00 pm	Vendor Input to Experimental Design - <i>Roger Jenkins</i>
3:00 pm	Categorization and Implementation of Issues from New Design Inputs - <i>Roger Jenkins and Amy Dindal</i>
4:00 pm	Where do we go from here? Outstanding Issues and Schedule - <i>Amy Dindal</i>
4:30 pm	Wrap-up and Adjourn - <i>Eric Koglin</i>

## **Participants List**

### **Vendors**

Gallard-Schlesinger Industries (Henry Medollo)  
HybriVet (Meredith Hunter)  
Innov-X Systems (Don Sackett)  
Niton (Rose Koch)  
Thermo Noran (Peter Berry)

### **Technical Panel**

Kevin Ashley, NIOSH  
Peter Ashley, HUD  
Chuck Bayne, ORNL  
Bruce Buxton, Battelle Memorial Institute  
Amy Dindal, ORNL  
Warren Friedman, HUD  
Paul Halfmann, Massachusetts Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program  
Sharon Harper, EPA/RTP  
Roger Jenkins, ORNL  
Eric Koglin, EPA/NERL  
Gene Pinzer  
Oksana Pozda, EPA/OPPT  
Dan Reinhart, EPA/OPPT  
John Schwemberger, EPA/OPPT  
Darlene Watford, EPA/OPPT  
Kenn White, QuanTech/AIHA

### **ETV Program Office**

Penny Hansen

### **ICF Consulting**

Stephanie Barrett

### **Visitors**

Greg Mack, Battelle Memorial Institute  
Mike Neighbor, Battelle Memorial Institute

## Summary Notes

*All the presentations given at the meeting can be obtained via anonymous FTP at 128.219.57.47. For those of you unfamiliar with the process, just type into your Internet browser address window (Netscape, Internet Explorer, etc.) the following:*

*ftp://128.219.57.47/Lead\_Dust/*

*Select whatever file you want to download, and save it to your computer. Most browsers work by right mouse-clicking on the file, and then clicking "Save to Disk," "Copy to Folder", or some such thing.*

The meeting began around 9:10 am with introductory comments by Eric Koglin, US EPA Advanced Monitoring Technology Center Manager for the Environmental Technology Verification Program (ETV). Penny Hansen, director of ETV, gave an overview presentation of the Program. Koglin followed with a presentation of the Goals and Objectives of the Advanced Monitoring Technology Center. Roger Jenkins, program manager for the ETV program at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), gave a presentation on the vendor's return on investment for participating in the ETV program.

After a short break, four presentations were given from different segments of the lead community: 1) federal user (Peter Ashley, HUD); 2) regulator (John Schwemberger, EPA/OPPT); 3) Industry, including the American Industrial Hygiene Association, inspectors, risk assessors, abatement contractors, and remodelers (Kenn White, QuanTech); and 4) state user (Paul Halfmann, Massachusetts Department of Public Health).

After lunch, much of the afternoon was dedicated to discussing the experimental design. Amy Dindal (ORNL Technical Lead) and Chuck Bayne (ORNL Computer Science and Mathematics Division) gave a joint presentation on the experimental design elements that are currently being proposed to the vendors. This was identical to the presentation that was distributed to the vendors the week before the meeting. The group then engaged in discussion on various aspects of the design, including the following three major topics:

1) Possible alternatives to the ELPAT samples: The ELPAT samples are prepared gravimetrically with 100 mg of dust loaded uniformly in the center of each Pace Wipe. The vendors raised the issue that this type of sample would not be typical of a sample acquired by actually wiping a surface. The XRF manufacturers noted that they would have to spread the dust mound out across the wipe, which would be a subjective process. The vendors requested that the difference in procedure to account for this step be recognized in the report as being atypical of normal operations. HUD suggested that an adjusted production rate (i.e., sample throughput) be considered to compensate for the extra preparation time. The group agreed that the ELPAT samples are the benchmark that is accepted in this industry and should be the foundation of the experimental design.

2) Different samples for test kits: The dust wipe sample is difficult for the test kit vendors to deal with, given the fact that the operation of the kit involves collecting a dust sample from the surface. Also, because the test kits are inherently sensitive (a few  $\mu\text{g}$  of lead), presumably all of the samples would easily be detected. The group discussed the possibility of using bulk dust or generating dust samples of known quantities on a surface. This issue was left unresolved, but ORNL is working on alternative options for the test kit vendors.

3) Selection of laboratory method: The technical panel has recommended either sonication or hot plate/acid digestion, followed by AA or ICP, for the laboratory method to be used for comparison with the field measurements. Most of the laboratories participating in the ELPAT program use hot plate/AA, but the top

six laboratories (in terms of number of samples analyzed per year) use sonication/AA or ICP. Hot plate has historically been the method of choice, but it is also more time-consuming and more costly. The group did not resolve this issue, but it will be the subject of a future technical panel teleconference.

The last presentation of the day discussed the schedule of upcoming events. Many of the vendors supported having the verification test in conjunction with the Northeast Regional Conference on LeadSafe Housing and Healthy Homes which will be held November 7-9, in Hartford, CT. We would be part of the meeting agenda where the group participating in the meeting would come over to the test site and see the technologies in action. Participants in the meeting would include risk assessors for New England states, New York, and New Jersey. The vendors would be able to have a booth at the meeting for \$500. A similar meeting for the Mid-Atlantic Region is being planned for Pittsburgh on October 28-30.